



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

pardon us if we have not spoken with befitting respect of the theological and political opinions of his seven-times-great-grandmother. For our own part, the study of every authentic record of the sayings and the doings of these men only increases our admiration of the prudence and the statesmanship, as well as the uprightness, the self-denial, and the piety with which they governed their little commonwealth, and laid the foundations of the present character and present prosperity of New England.

ART. IV.—*Memorials and Correspondence of CHARLES JAMES FOX.* Edited by the RT. HON. LORD JOHN RUSSELL, M. P. Philadelphia, Blanchard & Lea. 1853. 2 vols. 12mo.

“THERE is not a better man in England than Lord John Russell; but his worst failure is, that he is utterly ignorant of all moral fear; there is nothing he would not undertake. I believe he would perform the operation for the stone, build St. Peter's, or assume (with or without ten minutes' notice) the command of the Channel fleet; and no one would discover, from his manner, that the patient had died, the church tumbled down, and the Channel fleet been knocked to atoms.”* The witty Canon of St. Paul's, whose own versatility was hardly less than that which he has here so epigrammatically described, would have beheld with astonishment the literary freaks of the many-sided Premier; for the experience of the last year enables us to say that he would undertake, with alacrity, to write the Life or edit the Correspondence of any man in England; from the Duke of Wellington down to Joseph Grimaldi; and from any light that Lord John would condescend to throw upon the subject, an uninformed reader would be left to guess which of his victims penetrated the columns of Marmont at Salamanca, and which nightly amused her Majesty's subjects at Astley's.

There are many things which the distinguished politician who edits this compilation has done exceedingly well; but

* Sidney Smith's *Second Letter to Archbishop Singleton*.

there are some things he certainly has done equally ill. He is Jack the Giant-killer, who was active in the slaughter of the kindred monsters of Rotten-borough and Corn-law; but he is also "the little boy who chalked 'No Popery' on Cardinal Wiseman's door, and then ran away." (*Vide* Punch.) If he was not so sanguine as to anticipate, with the impulsive Brougham, that every peasant in England would, through the potent influences of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, be educated to understand Bacon, he has done all that one man can do to realize the hope of William Cobbett, that every poor man in the realm might have bacon to eat. Unfortunately, however, Lord John's administrative career was cut short by the accession of the Conservatives to power; and during the brief interval for which they retained it, the public were presented with the Life and Correspondence of Moore, and the Memorials and Correspondence of Fox, as the fruits of the Ex-Premier's leisure.

The former of these two productions has been already noticed in this Review, and we allude to it again only to compare it with Lord John's more recent effort. It was not entirely the editor's fault that that work gave so little satisfaction; for it was Moore's misfortune that he had nothing better to do than to keep a Diary, in which he had the indiscretion to chronicle the very smallest of beer; — good and bad, "poor Tom" set it all down, very little in malice, and nothing extenuating. How sorry he was to leave his darling Bessie — how delighted he was to be invited to sing his pretty melodies before applauding peers and lovely Right Honorables — his little griefs and his great joys — his dinners, and his "ices at Tortoni's." (Moore's journal, while at Paris, is as full of allusions to "ices," as if it had been originally kept on papyrus, and written in hieroglyphics, by a religiously-inclined gentleman of Thebes, some five hundred years before the invasion of Cambyces.) The bard of Erin, we fear, would have prized more highly the connection of his name with that of a scion of the House of Bedford, than all the laurels that fashion and taste have placed upon the brow of him who sang that more than Elysian transit through the Valley of Cashmere.

But the case is far different with the papers of Charles Fox. The descendant of Henri-Quatre and Charles I., and, more than that, the great liberal statesman of the reign of George III., had nothing to gain from an aristocratic editor. The readers of history had a right to expect that, whenever it should be convenient or proper to publish the life or correspondence of one who had so great an influence upon the politics of his times, the work should be done finally and completely; and surely it was worth doing well. Now, the volumes before us we regard as emphatically a work of supererogation; for the continuous narrative of the life of Fox is reserved, by the editor's own confession, for a future historian. Then why did he not leave to him, also, the entire correspondence, with such annotations only as the late Lord Holland might see fit to make upon the papers of his distinguished relative? Here, however, we have four editors at once, Lord Holland, Lord John Russell, Horace Walpole, and Mr. Allen, inserting into the correspondence of a great statesman every kind of annotation, relative and irrelative; and it is announced that these are but the crude materials out of which some enterprising gentleman, in the next century, perhaps, is to elaborate a complete history. We include Horace Walpole among these editors, for he is made by the other three to figure as such; and, as nearly as we can ascertain, his share of the work is larger than that of all the others put together. If the noble editor, under whose name the mass is now published, found the papers bequeathed to him by Lady Holland in a more hopelessly chaotic condition than he has left them in, we can readily forgive him for not having better accomplished his task; but he certainly should have rendered at least the darkness visible, instead of superimposing a little chaos of his own. It is not from incapacity that Lord John has failed again; for, many years ago, he published the comparatively uninteresting Life of his ancestor, Lord William Russell, which was a respectable addition to a sort of literature quite fashionable in England, — the political history of the aristocracy.

If it was a mistake to intrust so important a matter to one who could give so little attention to it as the adroit leader of

an always active and watchful political party, we cannot but consider it a still greater mistake, that so delicate a task was left to the discretion of so thorough a partisan. The vice of almost all English history is the spirit of faction which pervades it. An event, whether it may have occurred twenty years ago or two hundred, is not judged by its abstract merits, but by the preponderance of Whig or Tory influence which it manifests; and the virulence of the attack upon measures and persons is not often diminished by distance. For example; in a recent history treating mainly of the accession of William of Orange to the English throne, individuals and classes who, conscientiously, as they thought, opposed the revolution, are pursued with a vindictiveness often amounting to scurrility; while some of the great families who brought it about, and who would, for similar motives, have invited over the Cham of Tartary, are lauded with a minuteness and tawdriness of panegyric that would be ridiculous even in one of Mrs. Gore's novels. But if it is unreasonable to expect fairness in a partisan historian, it certainly is not so to require of an editor that he shall not obscure, if he cannot illumine, his subject. We challenge any man to find, in these volumes, where he would naturally expect to find it, any thing for which such works are commonly consulted, or to discover, without constant perplexity, which of the four annotators happens to be elucidating a given point; and we think that those familiar with English history, during the space which these two volumes cover, will agree with us in the conclusion, that, apart from the correspondence itself, there is nothing told here which has not been better told before; that the student will find nothing in them that he cannot more readily find elsewhere; that, in the common authorities for the period, he will hardly find any thing less to his purpose than what these gentlemen have been pleased to insert; and, if the object of each *quasi* editor has been only to mystify the reader, that Lord John has triumphed *à merveille* over his three predecessors.

The family of Charles James Fox, on his father's side, was of recent nobility. Stephen Fox, Master of the Horse to Charles II., was of humble birth; but he became a member of Parliament and a Baronet. His daughters, by his first

wife, married into noble families ; and his sons, by his second, became Baron Ilchester and Baron Holland. Their descendants have risen to a still higher rank in the peerage, and the titles are now Earl of Ilchester and Viscount Holland. On his mother's side, Charles Fox inherited the blood of the royal families of France and of England. Henry Fox, second son of Sir Stephen, married Lady Georgiana Caroline, eldest daughter of the second Duke of Richmond. Charles James Fox was his third son, and was born January 24 (13), 1749. That he was rather a precocious boy is shown in many incidents which his biographers relate. Fell says, that when Charles was only eight years old, he went one evening into his father's library, where the Secretary of State was copying despatches. Taking one of them from the table, Charles read it, and with an expression of dissatisfaction, tossed it into the fire ; and his father wrote another, without any remark. It is mentioned in this work, on the authority of Sir G. Colebrook, that " Mr. Fox's children were to receive no contradiction. Having promised Charles that he should be present when a garden wall was to be flung down, and having forgotten it, the wall was built up again that he might perform his promise." When Charles was but fourteen years old, he travelled with his father on the Continent ; and it is said that Lord Holland allowed his son five guineas a night at Spa to gamble with. If this is true, we can have very little compassion for the father when he was afterwards obliged to pay £140,000 for his son's debts of honor. Singularly enough, we find Charles writing, a year or two later, to his friend Sir George Macartney, — " I hear there is very deep play at St. Petersburg ; I hope that will not tempt you to break your resolution against gaming." He was the favorite child. Lord Holland, writing to Lady Caroline, says, on one occasion, " I got to Holland House at seven, found all the boys well ; but, to say the truth, took most notice of Charles. I never saw him better or more merry." " I will not deny," says Mr. Fox himself, " that I was a very sensible little boy, and what I heard made an impression upon me, and was of use to me afterwards." At the age of nine, he was brought up from Eton to be present at the coronation of

George III. A few years afterwards, the Duke of Devonshire writes to Lord Holland, "Commend me to your son Charles, for his sagacity." A strong expression from a grave man, as the editor remarks, in a grave letter about a lad scarcely fourteen years old.

After he had spent four months of idleness, or as we have seen, of something worse than idleness, on the Continent, Charles returned, at his own desire, to Eton. Fresh as he was from the brilliant society of France and Germany, he was but ill-treated by the boys, and not much better by the master. After six months, his father went down to hear him speak, and took him back to London, to hear the debates in Parliament upon the publications of the notorious Wilkes. He was present when the House of Commons voted the 45th number of the *North Briton* "a false, scandalous, and seditious libel," and could hardly have failed to become strengthened in prejudices which showed themselves soon after he took his seat in the House, but which he spent a lifetime in atoning for and combating in others. In a letter which he wrote to Sir George Macartney, we find an allusion to a poem which is familiar to millions who have never heard of the great statesman himself. "If there were any way of sending you pamphlets, I would send you a new poem, called the 'Traveller,' which appears to me to have a great deal of merit." Time, after all, is a leveller; for one cannot be said to know any thing of English literature if he has not studied Oliver Goldsmith, while any man may be pardoned for knowing little or nothing of the "Holland connection."

There seems to be a difference of opinion as to Mr. Fox's scholarship. Lord John Russell, of course, is willing to allow his hero all the merit on that account which he deserves. But the truth is, that without being a pedant, Charles Fox was a scholar. He had but an indifferent opinion of the value of classical studies; and yet one of his biographers tells us, that a clergyman, eminent for his knowledge of Greek, one day maintained that a particular verse in the *Iliad* could not be genuine, because the measure did not conform to the Homeric stanza; when Mr. Fox, who had taken no part in the discussion, immediately recited twenty verses from the

Iliad in the identical measure. Our own conclusion from this incident would be, that, so far from establishing Mr. Fox's claim to scholarship, the anecdote only invalidates effectually that of his clerical friend. In a letter, written at the age of sixteen, from which we have already quoted, he says, "I read here much, and like vastly what I know you think useless, mathematics. I believe they are useful, and I am sure they are entertaining, [shade of Euclid!] which is alone enough to recommend them to me." Having expressed the opinion that "to a man who reads a great deal, there cannot be a more agreeable place than Oxford," he adds:—

"To tell you the truth, I have read a great deal since you left England, and have learnt nothing. I employed almost my whole time at Oxford in the mathematical and classical knowledge, but more particularly in the latter, so that I understand Latin and Greek tolerably well. I am totally ignorant in every part of useful knowledge. I am more convinced every day how little advantage there is in being what at school and the University is called a good scholar; one receives a good deal of amusement from it, but that is all. At present I read nothing but Italian, which I am immoderately fond of, particularly of the poetry. You, who understand Italian so well yourself, will not at all wonder at this. As to French, I am far from being so thorough a master of it as I could wish; but I know so much of it that I could perfect myself in it at any time with very little trouble, especially if I pass three or four months in France."

It is very certain that his knowledge of French was both extensive and accurate. In his fifteenth year, he wrote a poem in French, of some twenty-four lines, which not only shows his familiarity with the language, but indicates the very early age at which he reflected on important political questions.

Whatever Mr. Fox undertook to do, he endeavored to do well. To qualify himself for the useful art of carving, he was accustomed to lay his book of instructions upon the table, and to study the science by actual practice upon the "subject;" and later in life, when Secretary of State, piqued at an observation upon the badness of his writing, he took lessons in chirography, and wrote copies like a school-boy. When living in the country, he devoted him-

self to the practical work of a gardener; and being once asked, in mature life, how, though grown so corpulent, he continued to pick up the "cut balls" at tennis so well, he replied, "because I am a very painstaking man."

That elegant recreation, which, while it may be elevated to a study, is tasteful merely as an amusement, conventionally styled "private theatricals," was with Mr. Fox, in his younger days, a passion. The father of the late Lord Holland, who died before the first Lord, built a theatre at his country-house at Winterslow, chiefly at the instigation of his brother Charles, who divided the Thespian laurels with Lady Mary Fox and her brother, Richard Fitzpatrick. Charles and Richard were nearly equal as to merit; in tragedy, they took alternately the principal parts; and if Mr. Fox was, upon the whole, preferred in tragedy, Fitzpatrick carried away the palm in genteel comedy. Mr. Fox had read at Oxford a prodigious number of plays. He and his friend Dickson, afterwards Bishop of Down, studied very hard, and their only relaxation consisted in reading together the early dramatic poets of England, spending most of their evenings for this purpose at a bookseller's shop. Mr. Fox said afterwards, that there was no play extant, written and published before the Restoration, that he had not read attentively. His letters frequently show how well stored was his mind with quotations, and it is unquestionably owing to his proficiency in acting, and to his knowledge of plays, that his oratory was so effective, and his expressions so felicitous. The year before he entered Parliament, he addressed a "professional" letter to Mr. Fitzpatrick, the following extract from which will show how deeply he interested himself in the subject:—

"Your letter has put me in mind of acting, and made me extremely eager for some more plays; though, to tell you the truth, the last time I acted I fell very short of my own expectations. However, my spirit is not entirely broken; but I will avoid appearing in any very conspicuous part, if possible. Your sister is a very good actress. Lady Sarah's fame is well known. Ste* acted extremely well in the comedy; in the tragedy, he did not know his part. Carlisle is not an excellent actor, but will make a very useful one. Dickson acted

* Stephen Fox, his brother.

the small part he had in the tragedy very ill, chiefly, I believe, from carelessness. He acted one or two scenes in the comedy inimitably, and all well. He will be of great use to us. Peter Brodie is the best manager-prompter in the world. We want another actor or two, but much more another actress. There are very few comedies that do not require above two women. You may tell my brother I can get two actors for him — one goodish, the other badish. I have so bad a taste as to differ from you very much about the French stage. I allow the French actors to be much better than ours; but I think our plays are infinitely better. Here at Florence, the people are clever at every other species of writing imaginable but the dramatic. All Italian plays are imitations, either of Greek, Latin, or French ones; but if the Italians are, in this respect, inferior to the French, English, &c., they are fully revenged in every other. For God's sake, learn Italian as fast as you can, if it be only to read Ariosto. There is more good poetry in Italian than in all other languages that I understand put together. Make haste and read all these things, that you may be fit to talk to Christians."

We intended to give an extract from one of the interlocutions, (or whatever they may be called,) containing a rather coarse description of Mr. Fox's personal appearance, as he sat in bed in the middle of the day, unkempt and unshorn, holding a levee of his political and social friends. But we have searched for it in vain; and as it is impossible, through the ingenious device of the editor for puzzling the reader, to find any thing, without a careful examination of every page in the book separately, we must leave those who may be curious in the matter, to hunt it up for themselves. In the mean time, we may be pardoned for transcribing a more agreeable picture from the autobiography of that egotistical, but genial old gossip, Leigh Hunt:—

"Some years later, I saw Mr. Pitt in a blue coat, buckskin breeches, and boots, and a round hat, with powder and pigtail. He was thin and gaunt, with his hat off his forehead, and his nose in the air. Later still, I saw Mr. Fox, fat and jovial, though he was then declining. He who had been a 'beau' in his youth, then looked something Quaker-like in his dress, with plain colored clothes, a broad round hat, and, if I am not mistaken, white stockings. He was standing in Parliament street, just where the street commences as you leave Whitehall; and was making two young gentlemen laugh heartily at something he seemed to be relating."

The biographer, Fell, describes him in his younger days as being an extravagant beau, and a leader of the fashion, distinguished among the dandies for the fineness of his Parisian velvet, and the splendor of his red heels. He said of himself once, that, "if he did not return like Charles II., with all the vices of the Continent, his wardrobe contained all its fashions." We shall have little to say of the private life of Mr. Fox, or of his domestic circumstances, as these volumes rarely allude to either. There were strangely mingled in him, however, the elements of the statesman and the man of pleasure; the vindictiveness and acerbity which characterized the public men of his country and age, and that sweetness of disposition, the distinguishing trait of his family, which made him the "Dear Charles" of all his friends, not excepting his hardly creditable acquaintance, the Prince of Wales, afterwards George IV.; which made him the best loved, as he had other traits which made him the best abused, man of his time.

Before we come to speak of the political career of Charles Fox, it may be well to mention two, at least, of his contemporaries, with whom Americans, as well as himself, have had most to do,—the King of England, and his confidant and minister, Lord North.

George III. was the central sun about whom revolved the lesser luminaries and their satellites, bound on their courses by the laws of place and power, peerage and pension,—laws as resistless as those of gravitation itself. He was neither the wisest nor the best of men; but he should be judged only by comparison. He certainly was not a very wise man; but, compared with his two immediate predecessors, neither of whom knew, or cared to know, the language or the customs of the country which, for reasons they could hardly comprehend, they had mysteriously been called upon to govern,—the wisdom of George III. was that of Solomon. His enemies maintained that he was not a very good man; but, compared with his son and successor, his virtues appear transcendent: for in every vice for which Englishmen should have hated him, in every meanness for which any gentleman should have shunned him, in every sin for the commission of which the humblest of the human race may look down with con-

tempt upon the proudest descendant of the Crusaders, he who was called the first gentleman in his realm, George Frederick of Brunswick, Prince of Wales, Prince Regent and King of England, could lay his hand among the ribbons and stars on his breast, and say truly that his peer was not among the inhabitants of earth. George III. was both a tyrant and a meddler; but he was made so by the force of circumstances. He was a tyrant, because he cared little for the country over which he reigned, except so far as the preservation of its territory added to his own dignity. His whole career, however, showed that he felt himself not dependent upon the English crown for his happiness. He frequently threatened to abdicate, and he never forgot that, while he was king of England, he was also a German elector. The descendant of Azo and Cunegunde could hardly have felt much interest in the selfish intrigues of the mostly new nobility which surrounded him. He was a proficient in the etiquette of a court, and he would have much preferred the liberty of tyranny in his hereditary kingdom of Hanover, to being bound down by the craftiness of men he hardly knew. He was obstinate and cruel in his tyranny; that the descendants of those who had once been Englishmen might be beaten and humbled, men were dragged from their wives and children and homes among the sunny vineyards of the Rhine, and *sold*, to be transported to a new world they had never heard of, to fight there, side by side, with the scalping and torturing savages of the north-west, whom a more fiendish barbarism than their own had let loose upon defenceless women and children. He was a meddler, and very often a ridiculous one; but he meddled because he fancied he saw misgovernment where he did not interfere; and he was very apt to regard that only as misgovernment which tended to thwart his own despotic views.

The favorite of the King, at the commencement of Mr. Fox's political career, was Lord North, the eldest son of the Earl of Guilford, who was the Queen's Chamberlain. It has been the fashion to speak of this minister as the author and abettor of the American war; while the truth is, that the war had no more honest opponent than Lord North. At the same time, he must continue to be held responsible, by Americans,

for some of the cruelties of the war, and by Englishmen, for most of its miscarriages. Beloved and trusted by his King, an enemy to no man, to no body or nation of men, on earth, he repeatedly requested permission to resign, on account of his difference of opinion with the King upon the matter of the American war, and of his unwillingness to adopt the only measures which would satisfy the imperious and relentless nature of his royal master. But the King invariably refused to dispense with his services ; for George III. had not many sincere friends among the aristocracy, and he had the sagacity to see that the hearty good nature, the perfect imperturbability, of Lord North was much to his purpose. All the blandishments of royal favor were employed to keep him in his place, and the good-natured nobleman yielded. He sacrificed, in so yielding, the interests of the foreign colonies to the demands of his King, to the policy of his party, and, we blush to say, to the passions of his nation ; and by a persistence in measures which were not only unjust but inefficient, he alienated those colonies, and made them independent of all three,—King, Tories, and Mob. Lord North was not inimical to America ; yet he believed, with the entire body of his countrymen, in an abstract and inalienable right of the government of Great Britain to include taxation of the colonies among the attributes of sovereignty. In America, the question was determined without an argument ; we thought taxation unjust and oppressive, and we prepared to resist it. It was the colonists more than the English who had fought the elder Pitt's battles on the Ohio, while Prussia fought them on the Main ; it was men like George Washington who had made America too hot for France, and we had not learned the art of war in vain.

It is a melancholy, but now an unquestioned truth, that the American war, thus undertaken to please the King, and so ill conducted by the ministers, was popular among nearly all classes in England. The national vanity rejected the idea that the Yankees could ever prove a match for those disciplined troops, in whose invincible prowess and valor they religiously believed. They could not think that the great empire on which the "sun never set," and which had become so prosperous through its almost annual "annexations," could

ever be dismembered. But our trans-Atlantic brethren soon learned some unpalatable truths. The opinions held among the English people, relative to the American war, prove that popular wars are not more likely than others to have right and justice on their side, and also that they are not more likely than others to succeed. The English press advocated the war, and it has hardly ever been more insulting or mendacious than it was then. The country gentlemen uniformly supported the ministry, as they were bound to do, because American taxation was devised that they might be relieved from taxes upon their lands; and all those who were likely to be influenced by the landed gentry, especially the great body of the clergy, applauded and justified the war. We had but few friends in the "mother country," for our fathers were not among those whom our mother delighted to honor. Many of those who indirectly helped us most, did so less because they loved America, than because they hated the King and his ministers. Among these, we fear, we must rank Lord Chatham, in spite of his eloquent speeches on behalf of the colonies, and especially that most impassioned invective against the employment of savages in the war, which will be spoken for many years yet by American school-boys. Alas for human nature! Lord Chatham's philanthropy did not include Frenchmen, and he is charged with being the first civilized man who ever resorted to the barbarity which he then denounced. But we fortunately had a few real and indefatigable friends, both in and out of Parliament, though we best know and honor those who never failed to speak for us, as well as to denounce our enemies. The names of Burke, of Barré, Conway, Pownall, and others, will ever be dear to the hearts of Americans; and deserving of the highest place in the affections of a grateful people is the memory of Charles James Fox.

The political career of Mr. Fox cannot be said to have commenced till the year 1774, though he could hardly have been an indifferent spectator of the events which occurred during the earlier years of his life. "Pert and argumentative," he must have mingled in the discussions of the day; and, indeed, the very earliest of his letters indicate the tendency of his mind toward politics. He had entered Parliament at the

age of nineteen, having been returned by the borough of Midhurst, on the 10th of May, 1768. He was then on the side of the government; his second speech was in support of the expulsion of Wilkes, and his third on the petition against the return of Colonel Luttrell for Middlesex. His elder brother spoke also on the same side, and Horace Walpole says of the two, "Stephen Fox indecently and indiscreetly said, 'Wilkes had been chosen by the scum of the earth;'" Charles Fox, with infinite superiority in parts, was not inferior to his brother in insolence." It is hardly necessary to state that Lord Holland bought the borough of Midhurst, and that Mr. Fox came in as a supporter of the government, which he appears to have been till he resigned his office as one of the Lords of the Admiralty, to which he had been appointed February 24, 1770. He held this office only two years, retiring because he fancied Lord North did not treat him with the confidence and attention he used to, and also because he had determined to vote against the Royal Marriage Bill, which, as a place-holder, he would be ashamed to do. This bill was originated by George III. himself; it was forced upon his ministers against their will, and all in either House who voted against it incurred his implacable resentment. After Mr. Fox's resignation, in 1772, there was a motion in the House for expunging thanks to Dr. Nowell for a sermon vindicating Charles I., which was carried by a vote of nearly four to one. General Keppel, Colonel Fitzroy, and Charles Fox, all descendants of Charles I., voted against the sermon, as did many of the courtiers; among them, Jeremiah Dyson, who said, "If King Charles's grandsons vote against it, sure I may." In May, 1772, Mr. Fox's Marriage Bill, which he introduced so handsomely as to elicit the highest praise from Horace Walpole, and had then neglected, was thrown out without a debate, by a vote of 93 to 34. The bill removed all restraints upon marriage, except the single one of a register. In December of this year, a new disposition of places was made, and Mr. Fox was appointed a Lord of the Treasury.

The year that elapsed between Mr. Fox's retirement from the Admiralty, and his acceptance of an office in the Treasury, was more favorable to the development of his liberalism,

than it proved to be to his private morality. He indulged more than ever in his passion for play; and this, with the ensuing years, was the period of his greatest losses. But he also contrived to break away from the pernicious influences of his father's political example and instruction. The first Lord Holland started in life as a needy political adventurer. He attached himself warmly to Sir Robert Walpole, and had added to the audacity of his nature the corruption and the harshness which characterized that minister's policy. But he was now sinking under disease and depression of spirits; and Charles had begun to outgrow that blind adherence to the paternal dogmas which his affectionate disposition had hitherto seemed to require. He had, moreover, thrown off the shackles of office; and though he shortly resumed them, he had braced his mind to an independent use of its faculties, and had contracted friendships with many who afterwards nobly seconded his efforts in behalf of civil liberty and concession.

During Mr. Fox's second connection with the government, he appears to have done little, till the final affair which caused his dismissal by Lord North. In the debates in East India affairs, he took a violent part against Lord Clive, whom he described as "the origin of all plunders and the source of all robbery." At the beginning of the year 1774, a gross attack was made, in the "Public Advertiser," upon the Speaker, Sir Fletcher Norton, for partiality in a certain matter that had been before the House. The Speaker, at the next meeting of the House, called upon certain members to acquit him of partiality, which was done, and the orders of the day were called for. This would have ended the matter; but a few members thought this a proper time to assert the honor of the House against the insolence of the press. Taunts and recriminations passed between the two parties, and finally, Mr. Woodfall, the printer, was summoned to the bar, where he made a satisfactory explanation and apology. His conduct greatly softened the House; but Mr. Fox, who had become fairly roused, injudiciously insisted upon committing the printer to Newgate. Lord North vacillated; he had pledged himself to Mr. Fox, and was yet inclined to milder measures. The motion for imprisonment was defeated, and Lord North compromised the

matter by making his friends vote with the majority, while he kept his word by personally voting with Mr. Fox's minority. The King was highly incensed at the course taken by Mr. Fox, and wrote to Lord North, "Indeed, that young man has so thoroughly cast off every principle of common honor and honesty, that he must become as contemptible as he is odious." And again, a week later, he says, "I think Mr. Charles Fox would have acted more becoming to you and himself, if he had absented himself from the House; for his conduct is not to be attributed to conscience, but to his aversion to all restraints." These instigations had the desired effect; and on the 24th of February, Mr. Fox was dismissed by Lord North.

Mr. Fox was now twenty-five years old, a man of the world, a scholar, and a statesman. He had embarked on a political career which ended only with his death. We have seen his own preparation for it; let us now look at the position in which he found his country. His father had long been a leader in the contentions and the diplomacy of a former reign, and had intended that Charles should succeed to his command, and his instructions commenced almost with boyhood.

First in the long series of wars and of diplomatic intrigue, the young Charles must have contemplated the great game which his country had played, with a move now upon the plains of Germany, and now in the wilds of the New World. It had commenced before he was born; and what was virtually the same contest was at its height when he died; its relations and consequences influenced both his administrations. The grandson of that Margrave of Brandenburg, who had created a Kingdom out of the little Duchy of Prussia, had added to the fame and to the crimes of his family by robbing the lovely daughter of Charles VI. of one of the oldest of the possessions of the house of Hapsburgh. The consequences of that crime have scarcely yet ceased to be felt. Through the mediation of England, Maria Theresa bought off Frederic by the relinquishment of Silesia, and then drove his allies from her territory. After sixteen years of smothered revenge, she had intrigued successfully with the Court of Versailles, and had engaged the House of Bourbon in a new scheme of alliance and policy. Then really commenced those memora-

ble struggles, which continued till the French Revolution changed the currents of political strife, and united all the monarchies of Europe against itself. Frederic was forced to begin that seven-years' war, at whose close he found himself the greatest warrior that the continent of Europe had known since the reign of Charlemagne, and it has known but *one* greater since. He had at first been aided, and at last deserted, by England; and it was when he found himself dependent on his own nearly exhausted resources, and when the circle of his enemies was hemming him in, that he achieved the title of GREAT. The "upstart of Brandenburg" had thrust himself into the company of kings, and they found themselves not strong enough to contend with their new rival. The treaty of Hubertsburgh confirmed Frederic in the possession of Silesia, and the separate peace of Paris between England and France had temporarily ended the contest between these hereditary enemies.

Among the consequences of the seizure of Silesia in 1740 was the war between England and France, which was conducted in the wilds of America. The result of that war was the establishment of a British province in the place of the Canadian possessions of France; and the prophecy was attributed, though falsely, to the Marquis of Montcalm,—that the British colonies, relieved from the dread of France, would no longer manifest the same attachment, or practise an equal submission. It is singular, that, when the prediction came to pass, France should have been first and most efficient in its assistance to the colonies.

In 1765, the riots in opposition to the Stamp Act took place at Boston. Parliament met in January, 1766, and the famous debate took place on the right to tax America. Mr. Pitt (Lord Chatham) advised that the Stamp Act should be absolutely, totally, and immediately repealed, and that the reason be assigned that it was founded on an erroneous principle. "At the same time," he added, "let the sovereign authority of this country over the colonies be asserted in as strong terms as can be devised, and be made to extend to every kind of legislation whatsoever: That we may bind their trade, confine their manufactures, and exercise every power whatsoever, except

only that of taking their money from their pockets without their own consent." Shortly after the repeal of the Stamp Act, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, having proposed the renewal of a four-shilling land-tax, was defeated, and the tax reduced to three shillings in the pound. The ministry, upon this defeat, neither resigned nor retrenched. In an evil hour, it was proposed to levy a duty on tea in American ports, and the colonies then denied entirely the right of taxation. They were the more provoked to this, because, after Lord North's accession, the East India Company, in view of the large accumulation of tea in England, had offered to pay sixpence per pound export duty, if the government would remit the duty of threepence, which was to be raised in America; but the ministry were more anxious to maintain the right than to increase the revenue, and refused. It is not necessary to lay before American readers any further account of the struggle which ensued; a single point only deserves notice here.

It is well known that the colonists were much encouraged to persevere by the letters which Dr. Franklin addressed to the patriots in Massachusetts, while residing in London. From his shrewd survey of the state of parties, he assured his countrymen, if they were firm, that they had nothing to apprehend. Moreover, through his acquaintance with Mr. John Temple, he was permitted to see and to copy some letters, which had been addressed by Governor Hutchinson and by Mr. Oliver to Mr. Thomas Whately, Under-Secretary of State. These letters he transmitted to the General Assembly of Massachusetts, whose agent he was. The Assembly voted, 101 to 5, that these letters were designed to subvert the constitution, and petitioned the King to remove the obnoxious officers; the petition was transmitted to Franklin for presentation.

When the matter came before the Committee of the Privy Council, Wedderburne, the Solicitor-General of the Crown, waiving the proper subject of discussion, levelled the bitterest invective against Franklin, whom he denounced as *homo trium literarum*, a cant Roman expression for "fur," a thief. "This wily American," said he, "has forfeited all the respect of societies and men. Into what company will he hereafter go with an unembarrassed face, or the honest intrepidity of

virtue? Men will watch him with a jealous eye, and hide their papers from him. He will hereafter esteem it a libel to be called a man of *letters*." The Privy Council, with the exception of Lord North, applauded this scurrility with laughter and noisy assent; they reported that the petition was founded on false and erroneous allegations, and declared it to be "groundless, vexatious, and scandalous." Two days afterwards, Lord North dismissed Franklin from his post of Deputy-Postmaster.

For the important aid and encouragement that Franklin afforded his countrymen, he is hardly entitled to the gratitude of the English nation or government; but we question the ground upon which Lord John presumes to call him a not very sincere or upright man. The letters he was shown contained statements which he knew to be utterly false, and doctrines which he considered pernicious to the interests of his country; they misrepresented the public men and the people, both of which classes he fully understood, and their tendency was to delude the ministry into taking still more obnoxious steps, to say nothing of persisting in their old follies. Matters were already come to that stage when it was of the last importance to the colonies that there should be no traitors among them. His conduct is justifiable on every principle of duty to his country, which is the highest duty of a diplomatic agent. He was in London, not as the friend of Mr. Temple, but of the colonies; he violated no private friendship, but he performed a public duty. It certainly will not be denied, that when war exists, the belligerent parties are entitled to every advantage to be gained by the interception of despatches. If war did not already exist, it was all but inevitable, and these letters were, in every practical sense, despatches. They were from Colonial Governors to a Secretary of State, upon the matter of the government of a province. Moreover, it does not appear that Franklin did any thing more than to transmit copies which had been put into his possession. If any thing were wanting to show how absurd are the accusations against Franklin's sense of honor, and with how little grace such an accusation comes from across the Atlantic, we can refer to the exultation with which Sir Archibald Alison mentions the

"*Golden Key*" with which England became acquainted with the secrets of Courts and Treaties during the wars consequent upon the French Revolution.

Charles Fox brought his talents and eloquence to the aid of the opposition to Lord North's ministry; and we shall but briefly glance at his resistance to the policy of the crown, till he succeeded at last in ending the war by his own accession to office. His votes were uniformly in favor of the colonies. He thought that the power of restoring the port of Boston ought to be with the Parliament, and not with the Crown; and with his brother, he voted to repeal the duty on tea. In 1775, he moved to amend the Address to the King in such a way as to omit its substance; but the motion was lost, and the original Address, which began the war, was carried by a vote of 304 to 105. He soon succeeded in gaining his family connections over to the opposition; among them was Lord Ossory, an Irish peer.

The surrender of Burgoyne, at Saratoga, rendered the independence of the States next to certain: the negotiations at Paris between the American Commissioners and the French ministry soon ripened into a formal treaty, and France acknowledged the Declaration of 1776.* This was a most mortifying blow to the ministers, and it still farther exasperated the opposition; it could not fail to increase Mr. Fox's jealousy of the House of Bourbon, a feeling which developed itself so strongly afterwards, when he was in office. The abuse of the ministers was carried to the greatest lengths; but fortunately or unfortunately, Lord North never lost his good humor. On one occasion, Charles Fox attacked him for having called himself an unfortunate minister, and proved that all the disgrace had happened by ignorance, blunders, and misconduct,—not by misfortune. Lord North answered with some humor; and as

* Referring to the Declaration of Independence, Lord John mentions the fact that every thing offensive to the people of England was carefully struck out of it, and quotes the words of Jefferson, "The pusillanimous idea that we had friends in England worth keeping terms with, still haunted the minds of many;" and he adds, "the omission of these passages warp the truth of this memorable Declaration. George III. appears in it as a single and despotic tyrant; the fact was, that the Sovereign and his people were alike prejudiced, angry, and wilful." This goes to support what we have already said as to the *popularity* of the war.

Mr. Fox had accused him of idleness, and of listening to flatterers, he replied that he spent a great deal of his time in that House, which certainly was not idleness, and he heard while there a great deal of language which could hardly be called flattery. In March, 1778, there was an attempt to negotiate a new administration, in which Mr. Fox was to be prominent; but the negotiations failed. One of the proposed measures was to repeal all the American acts, but to adopt measures of force against France. In 1780, the correspondence of the King evinces a persistent desire of Lord North to retire, and the same resolute will of the King to continue the American war, and to maintain Lord North in office, as the most convenient tool for that purpose. He writes to him, "I am conscious if you will resolve with spirit to continue in your present employment, that with the assistance of a new Parliament, I shall be able to keep the present Constitution in its pristine lustre. You must be the judge whether you can honorably desert me when infallible ruin must ensue." The "infallible ruin" was American independence. The next year, the strength of the opposition was increased by the talents of the younger Pitt, who was destined to play so distinguished a part in opposition to all his early friends and predilections. It is remarkable that, of these two rivals, Mr. Fox commenced life by supporting a tory government, but soon changed to the widest liberalism; while Mr. Pitt began in opposition, but retained office almost all his life, and also wholly abandoned the liberal views he started with. Mr. Fox heartily congratulated his young rival upon the success of his first speech, and even Lord North said it was the best *first* speech he ever heard. The young men in the opposition made a considerable figure; among them were Sheridan and John Townsend.

The beginning of the year 1782 found the ministry tottering. Arrangements were making for inquiry into certain miscarriages, and among others, a motion was made by the Duke of Richmond to inquire into Lord Rawdon's conduct in executing Hayne. In June, of the previous year, Mr. Fox, in his motion for a committee to consider the American war, had shown, from Lord Cornwallis's last despatches in the Gazette, the utter impossibility of subduing America. Angry alterca-

tions had arisen in both Houses on the complaints made by the Duke and Mr. Fox, of peculiar severity to American prisoners; and the Lord Advocate Dundas had grossly abused the opposition for supporting rebels. Mr. Fox had been wounded in a duel with Mr. Adam,* the Duke of Richmond was challenged by Lord Rawdon, and Lord Shelburne by Lord Moira; so that there was certainly some ground for the suspicion of the not over-charitable Horace Walpole, that indirect assassination was to be the favorite manœuvre of the instruments of the Court. Though the eloquence of both Fox and Pitt, the latter hardly twenty-three years of age, annoyed the government and increased daily the forces of the opposition, the decisive blow was not struck till February 27, 1782, when General Conway had the immortal honor of moving "to declare the purpose of subduing the revolting colonies by force, impracticable;" which was carried by a vote of 234 to 215. For Mr. Fox's share in this resolution, he incurred the lasting hatred of the King, who, as we shall see hereafter, during important negotiations, never failed to ascribe to it every difficulty that accident threw in the way of his ministers. In reply to the Address consequent upon this motion, the King sternly and ungraciously told his Commons, that in pursuance of their advice, he should take such measures as should appear to *him* to be most conducive to the restoration of harmony between Great Britain and the revolted colonies. On the 8th of March, Lord John Cavendish introduced four resolutions—the first declaring that the war had cost £100,000,000; the second, stating the losses the country had sustained; the third, affirming that, besides America, Great Britain was at war with France, Spain, and Holland; and the fourth, that all this was owing to the want of foresight and ability in the King's ministers, whom he should move to have changed. The intrigue was not yet ripe, however, and the resolutions were rejected by a majority of ten. On the 10th, Lord North declared to the King that he was determined to resign his post. On the 15th, the same resolutions were again

* After the triumph of the Westminster Election, Mr. Adam is mentioned by Sir Nicholas Wrexall as joining with Colonel North, &c., in the ovation paid to Mr. Fox.

moved, but the ministers had a majority of nine, although the Prince of Wales was more active than ever in the opposition. The King had now made up his mind to abdicate rather than yield, and he wrote to Lord North with regard to the diminished majority, "If things go on as they seem to tend, I shall certainly know what my conscience as well as honor dictates, as the only way left me." Lord North having apparently reiterated his resolution, and remonstrated with his Majesty against such violent measures, he again writes, "Every man must be the sole judge of his own feelings; therefore, whatever you or any man can say has no avail with me." But on the 27th, after the change, he atones for this momentary harshness to so faithful and self-sacrificing a servant as Lord North had been to him. "The effusion of my sorrows has made me say more than I intended; but I ever did, and ever shall, look on you as a friend as well as a faithful servant."

It was intended by the Whigs that the dissolution of the ministry should be recorded formally as the act of the House of Commons, that its disgrace might be the more marked; but they were thwarted by the readiness and the imperturbable good humor of the minister, who was but too happy to be released. A motion of Lord Surrey's for the dismissal of the ministers stood for the 20th of March, and the opposition were anxious that it should come on before the resignation should be officially announced. Only half an hour before he came to the House, Lord North had got permission from the King to announce the resignation of the ministry. He and Lord Surrey rose at the same moment, the object of both was understood. After much clamor and disorder, Mr. Fox moved with great address, as the most regular way of extricating the House from its embarrassment, "that Lord Surrey be now heard." With yet more admirable presence of mind, Lord North at once rose and said, "I rise to speak to that motion," and, as his reason for opposing it, stated his resignation and the dissolution of the ministry. An adjournment took place. The night was bitter cold and snow falling; the members had sent away their carriages, and the ante-room was crowded. But Lord North's carriage was in waiting. Having placed one or two friends in it, who were to accompany him, he

turned to the triumphant crowd of his bitter enemies, and said good humoredly, "I *have* my carriage. You see, gentlemen, what it is to be in the secret. Good night." Mr. Adam, who dined with him that day, says that the temper of Lord North and of his whole family was remarkably calm, cheerful, and serene.

On the next day, the King sent for Lord Shelburne, but the interview resulted in nothing. Lord Gower, who was then, on account of the nonage of the Duke of Bedford, the head of that connection, was next consulted; but, though not entirely unambitious, he was too indolent or too timid to accept the office of Premier. The Marquis of Rockingham was the next person, as he could bring the largest accession of landed property, nobility, and popularity to the support of government. On the Sunday after the resignation, the King, through Lord Shelburne, offered the administration to Lord Rockingham, refusing however to see him. The list of the Cabinet was immediately prepared by the Marquis, as the condition of his acceptance; and being approved by a large meeting of members of the House of Commons, held in the evening at the house of Mr. Thomas Townsend, it was transmitted by Lord Shelburne, with his own approbation, to the King. The ministry, under which negotiations for peace with America and the powers which had befriended her, took place, was composed as follows: First Lord of the Treasury, Lord Rockingham; Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord John Cavendish; Secretaries of State, Charles Fox and Lord Shelburne; the remaining members were Admiral Keppel, the Duke of Richmond, the Duke of Grafton, Lord Camden, and General Conway; to which Lord Shelburne subsequently added, without consulting the other ministers, Mr. Dunning, who was created Lord Ashburton, and made Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, with an additional salary during life. Lord Thurlow was retained as Chancellor, for the reason, as Horace Walpole thinks, that his talents were too considerable to be driven into opposition. The preliminaries were all arranged by Lord Shelburne, and it was not till the 27th that Lord Rockingham was admitted to an audience with the King, and accepted the administration. Its inauguration shadowed forth its fate; and

there soon appeared the reasons for Mr. Fox's remark to his colleague, Lord Shelburne, "that he perceived this administration was to consist of two parts, one belonging to the King, the other to the public."

Omitting the usual squabbling for peerages and salaries, and postponing for the present Mr. Fox's views in his foreign policy, with regard to the increasing influence of the French Court, especially as he developed these views more fully when he accepted office for the second time, we find the next topic of interest in these volumes to be the Negotiation for Peace at Paris with the American Commissioners. Dr. Franklin having addressed a private letter to Lord Shelburne, with whom he had been acquainted in England, expressing a desire for a general peace, Lord Shelburne, as Secretary of State, despatched Mr. Oswald to the Doctor, describing him as a "pacific man, and conversant in those negotiations which are most beneficial to mankind, and preferred on that account to any speculative friends or to any persons of higher rank." Now the truth is notorious, that our highly respectable mother was ashamed to send a "person of quality" to negotiate with the plainly-dressed and equally plain-spoken agents of the republic. But let any one compare the knowledge of the world, the firmness, dignity, and, we are proud to say, superior tact, of Franklin, Adams, Jay, and Laurens, (with the advantage they had of the friendship of a court and a people preëminent for an admiration of talent under whatever circumstances,) with the uncertain, vacillating, querulous approaches of Messrs. Oswald and Grenville, who, while ostensibly seeking the same object, constantly endeavored to undermine each other's influence, one as agent of Lord Shelburne to Dr. Franklin, the other as agent of Mr. Fox to the Count de Vergennes.

Dr. Franklin was much pleased with Mr. Oswald, and sent him back to Lord Shelburne with a letter, stating that he wished to have no other communication with his lordship than through Mr. Oswald. One of the editorial corps, *apropos* of this, remarks, "The truth is, Dr. Franklin very quickly discovered that Mr. Oswald was a simple-minded, well-meaning man, on whom he could make the impression he chose, and

he desired to have no other negotiator to deal with." Now in his letter to Secretary Livingston, which we find in vol. vii. of Mr. Sparks's edition of the Diplomatic Correspondence of the Revolution, dated from Paris Nov. 16, 1782, Dr. Franklin thus alludes to the agents of the English ministry:—

"The English have sent Mr. Oswald, who is a very wise and good man, and, if untrammelled, would soon settle all; and Mr. Strachey, who is a keen and subtle one, although not deeply versed in such things; and a Mr. Roberts, who is a clerk in the Board of Trade, and Mr. Whithead, who is private secretary to Mr. Oswald. These gentlemen are very profuse in their professions of national friendship, of earnest desires to obliterate the remembrance of all unkindness, and to restore peace, harmony, friendship, and make them perpetual, by removing every seed of future discord. All this, on the part of Mr. Oswald personally, is very sincere. On the part of the nation, it may be so, at present; but I have my doubts as to whether it is a national disposition upon which we can have much dependence, and still more, whether it is the sincere intention of the Earl of Shelburne."

Mr. Adams also was of the opinion that Lord Shelburne desired only to keep matters in abeyance, in the hope that something would occur to excuse another campaign in America. It certainly is singular that the Earl, who was the King's friend in the Cabinet, should have been almost the only person in England willing to cede the Canadas to the United States; and there is only one other hypothesis that appears at all rational,—namely, that George III., thwarted by the Commons, who theoretically represent the nation, in the personal matter of his prerogative over the American Colonies, hardly cared how much he disgraced, by the dismemberment of its territory, a nation whose crown on three several occasions he spurned.

However this may be, Mr. Oswald returned to Paris with authority from the British government to settle with Dr. Franklin, at Paris, the most convenient time for setting on foot a negotiation for a general peace, upon the basis of independence to America and the restoration of Great Britain to the situation she was placed in by the treaty of 1763; and Mr. Thomas Grenville being accredited to the Count de Ver-

gennes, the double negotiation commenced. The position taken by America was honorable and firm. On the 22d of November, 1777, Congress resolved that "all proposals of a treaty between the King of Great Britain, or any of his commissioners, and the United States, inconsistent with the independence of the States, or with such treaties or alliances as may be formed under their authority, will be rejected by Congress." In April, of the following year, Congress *unanimously resolved*, "that these United States cannot, with propriety, hold any conference or treaty with any commissioners on the part of Great Britain, unless they shall, as a preliminary thereto, either withdraw their fleets and armies, or else, in positive and express terms, acknowledge the independence of the said States." The American Commissioners rested upon this ground, and demanded no other. Whatever may have been the amount of sincerity in Lord Shelburne's willingness to cede the Canadas, it is certain that, the next year, when the definitive treaties were signed, England was everywhere a loser. She had yielded in full the question of Irish legislation at home, and abroad she gave up the fruits of conquest in former wars. Without an ally in the political world, without a friend on the face of the habitable globe, her own existence depended on the grace and skill of a passive diplomacy. Catherine of Russia took an active share in the great Confederation against her absurd maritime pretensions, founded upon the accident of a naval supremacy. Frederic flew into a passion whenever the name of his former ally was mentioned. The unhappy Marie Antoinette had bound together, in a seemingly indissoluble connection, the Bourbons and the Cesars. England was obliged to make cessions of territory in almost every quarter of the globe; she irrevocably lost Minorca, Florida, Senegal, and Goree; and the thirteen colonies, with their almost illimitable territory, passed out of her hands. Yet America claimed nothing but her independence. America, whose prowess, in its very infancy, had stopped the aggressions of French adventurers, and wrung from their country territorial indemnification, generously yielded every thing but the glory of having placed a new nation among the great powers of the earth. The de-

scendants of the Puritans had long enough been involved in the contentions of Europe, and it was the wisdom of the Commissioners that left us untrammelled by European connections.

We are inclined to think, upon the whole, that Lord Shelburne was not sincere in his proposition for the cession of the Canadas. For Mr. Fox, who was sincerely in favor of our independence, and who had steadily opposed every stage of the war, was startled when the matter was broached to him by Mr. Oswald; and, notwithstanding the disadvantageous condition of England when the treaties were signed, the American Commissioners were too wise to insist upon an acquisition which might, after all, at that time, have proved embarrassing, if not dangerous. A material difference of opinion existed between the Earl and Mr. Fox, relative to the instructions which had been sent to the diplomatic agents at Paris. The minute of the Cabinet authorized Mr. Grenville "to propose the independence of America in the first instance, instead of making it the condition of a general treaty." Mr. Fox maintained that this was virtually a complete, final, and absolute recognition of American independence; and he intended to make the words clear and explicit to that effect. Lord Shelburne, however, contended that only a conditional recognition was meant, depending on the conclusion of a general treaty; and if peace were not effected, England and America would stand in the same relations as before the commencement of negotiations. This, with some indications of further designs for the reduction of the Colonies, alarmed Mr. Fox, who justly regarded Lord Shelburne's interpretation as laying the ground for renewed attempts, if France and Spain could not be brought to reasonable terms. Having been outvoted on the question, he informed his colleagues of his intention to resign. An event occurred, however, soon after he had expressed this determination, which threw the Cabinet into still greater confusion; this was the death of the Marquis of Rockingham.

On the day after Lord Rockingham's death, Lord Shelburne informed his colleagues that he had been requested by his Majesty to accept the Treasury; an announcement very

distasteful to the Whigs, who thought that a political friend of the Marquis only should have succeeded him. The Whigs out of office were for resisting the appointment of Lord Shelburne; those in office naturally hesitated. Mr. Fox, however, was firm; he told the King, that, in order to secure the support of those whom he considered the firmest friends of his Majesty's government, some person must be appointed in whom they had confidence. The King answered that the Treasury seemed naturally to devolve upon Lord Shelburne, for whom he had originally intended it. Mr. Fox replied that he did not consider Lord Shelburne as answering the description he had given; he therefore resigned the seals, upon the ground that the appointment of Lord Shelburne was a departure from the principles upon which he had accepted office.

Deserted by Mr. Fox, distrusted by a part of his colleagues, relying solely upon the King, and consulting none of his Cabinet but young William Pitt, Lord Shelburne was not long in making his administration exceedingly unpopular. The Duke of Richmond became dissatisfied; and, as soon as it was evident that Lord North and Mr. Fox were united in a determination to break down the ministry, its fate was no longer uncertain. On the 20th of February, 1783, the Duke of Grafton resigned the privy seal; on the 21st, Lord John Cavendish, for the purpose of whitewashing Lord North, made a motion in the House for censuring the peace, which was carried. None of the supplies for the year were voted; and, on the 23d, Lord Shelburne called a Cabinet, and in the evening assembled his adherents, at both which meetings he announced his intention of resigning his post. On the day of Lord Shelburne's resignation, the Duke of Portland, designed by the united factions as the ostensible minister, entreated the Duke of Richmond to stay in his place and unite with his friends, who would have all the power, as Lord North would have but a single place in the Cabinet. The Duke thanked him, but made the honorable reply, "That he could not see his name standing to so many protests against Lord North, and consent to act with him." Evident as was the fate of the ministry, it was not so clear who were to be its successors.

Mr. Pitt offered to unite with Lord North's *friends*, provided they would renounce all connection with a man so stigmatized by failure and disgrace; a proposition they indignantly rejected. On the other hand, Mr. Pitt drew himself up when Mr. Fox informed him he would have nothing to do where Lord Shelburne was concerned.

In the mean time, Lord North and Mr. Fox had met, at the house of George North, on Friday, the 14th of February, and arranged the preliminaries, agreeing to lay aside all former animosity, Mr. Fox declaring that he hoped their administration would be founded on mutual good-will and confidence, which was the only thing that could make it permanent and useful. This meeting did not long remain a secret; the very next day, efforts were made to bring about an interview between Lord North and Lord Shelburne. Lord North said, "I cannot meet Lord Shelburne now — it is too late." Those friends of Mr. Fox who had joined Lord Shelburne's administration, were filled with dismay, while Lord North's ministerial friends admitted that he had been shamefully used, but lamented the step he had taken.

Four days after Lord Shelburne's resignation, Mr. Pitt agreed to take the government, upon the assurance of some of his friends that Lord North would not be active in opposition; but reflecting upon the improbability of such a statement, he declined on the same day, by the advice of Lord Shelburne, or, as Horace Walpole says, because the King very drily and ungraciously offered it to him. His resolution was well taken; he probably foresaw that the coalition would fare ill enough, if it were permitted to run its own course. There were two factions to provide offices for, and the probable rapacity of the victors would undoubtedly furnish matter for the opposition to increase and consolidate its strength. Besides, Mr. Pitt would have only stood in the place of Lord Shelburne; the majority of the Commons were opposed to him, and would not be likely to vote the supplies.

The King, of course, was furious at the overthrow of his ministry, and at the prospect that he would be thrown into the hands of a man whom he hated with a rancor bordering, as Lord Brougham says, upon insanity. Meeting Lord

North's father, the Earl of Guilford, he exclaimed, wringing his hands, "Did I ever think, my Lord Guilford, that Lord North would have delivered me up in this manner to Mr. Fox!" He tried every way to avoid submitting to take the Duke of Portland and Mr. Fox as his ministers; and finally told the Lord Advocate that, sooner than yield, he would "go to Hanover," and the Queen actually consented to accompany him. Five years before, he had threatened the same thing; and he had, on one occasion, kept the royal yacht in waiting a fortnight for that purpose, saying, "if the people will not stand by me, they shall have another King; for I never will set my hand to what will make me miserable to the last hour of my life." The King, however, was compelled to accept the ministry dictated by the coalition, and, by the inflexible determination of Mr. Fox, to put the great seal in commission. The persons so ungraciously admitted to his councils were, — the Duke of Portland, as First Lord of the Treasury, Lord North and Mr. Fox, as Secretaries of State, and Lords Stormont, Carlisle, John Cavendish, and Keppel. It is creditable to Mr. Fox, that, in spite of his debts and distresses, neither in the arrangement of this administration, any more than that with Lord Rockingham, did he ever suggest, claim, or accept any office, pension, or reversion which could repair his broken fortunes.

The first object of importance which occupied the attention of the new ministry was the suggestion and favorite measure of the Duke of Portland, to make the large grant of £100,000 *per annum* to the Prince of Wales. The proposition was opposed by the King through mere hatred and jealousy, and so fiercely that there was reason to fear that it would break up the ministry. Mr. Fox generously incurred the odium, both at the Court and in public, of supporting the grant, advising the Prince to abstain from all indecent canvass, and to discountenance the tale-bearing and slander to which the Prince's society, or, as Lord Holland adds, "to speak more openly, the Prince's nature," had so manifest a tendency. The King obtained the equivocal triumph of thwarting both his ministers and his son, though he supplied the loss to the latter by giving him £50,000 a-year from his own civil list.

Not much was gained, upon the whole, as it afterward appeared that the Prince had actually spent £120,000 a-year ever since he came of age, and Parliament had to make up the deficit. The artifice resorted to, to procure the payment of his debts, will be hereafter noticed.

The grand objects of Mr. Fox's foreign policy were the same that he had attempted to compass during the brief period of Lord Rockingham's administration, — the completion of the work of peace by a definitive treaty, and the establishment of a European system to balance the vast influence which the House of Bourbon was acquiring upon the Continent. With regard to the first, the Count de Vergennes could not but view with distrust a person who had been elevated to office by means of a vote of censure upon a treaty whose preliminaries he had negotiated with his predecessor. He had also to contend with the animosity of the King, who never lost an opportunity to reproach him with the vote of the House of Commons for discontinuing the American war; there was, too, a suspicion that a secret correspondence was carried on between the Court and the English opposition, an opposition of which the King himself was the life and soul. There were, moreover, symptoms that the American agents, originally full of confidence in Mr. Fox, were more reserved in their intercourse, from a very natural apprehension that the influence of Lord North would prevent any effectual or permanent reconciliation.

The successful intervention of the Courts of Versailles and Madrid in the American Revolution, the recent marriage of the heir to the French throne with the daughter of Maria Theresa and Francis, and the Family Compact of the Bourbons certainly tended to give that House an overshadowing influence which might well excite the jealousy of an English statesman. Mr. Fox looked toward the Northern powers for aid in a countervailing confederation; but Frederic was too old and too cunning to be caught, and the ambitious and far-sighted Catherine had ulterior views of her own. The fact has a peculiar interest just now, that the price which England was willing to pay Russia for the *prestige* of her alliance, was her own interest in the existence of the Turkish empire. At that

time, France was opposed to the absorption of Turkey by the semichristianized barbarians of the North, and attempted a negotiation with England to prevent it. In August, 1783, the French ambassador pressed Mr. Fox upon the subject of Turkish affairs, which fact, we are sorry to say, the ministry advised the King to betray at once to the Court of St. Petersburg, to get the good will of the Empress. Mr. Fox writes to his ambassador at Paris, the Duke of Manchester, "I hope and trust the French will be sufficiently mortified by the reception of their remonstrance (for such it was) at St. Petersburg, and I flatter myself they will have still more reason to be so before the end of the business. Mr. D'Adhemar told me, some time since, that they should make a manifesto, complaining of the Empress's injustice, and of his most Christian Majesty not being seconded by other powers in his endeavors to prevent it. I hope to God they will do this, for I think nothing can make them so truly ridiculous." The King, in this matter, was induced to coincide with Mr. Fox; he had spoken of the Russian manifesto with much ill-humor and resentment, and intimated some degree of apprehension of being drawn into taking part with the Empress; but, upon Lord North's submitting to him the impolicy of joining France in opposition to Russia, he very readily concurred with him, and said, "that would be going a great deal too far." Mr. Fox writes in September to the Duke of Manchester, that he should think that "the stand taken by France against Russian aggression in the East ought to furnish the ministry with some opportunity of forming a league to balance the Family Compact;" and that, "in this article of a continental alliance, as a balance to the House of Bourbon, consists, as your Grace knows, the whole of my foreign politics." We cannot account for Mr. Fox's very illiberal conduct on this occasion, except upon the supposition that his jealousy of the Bourbons blinded him to every thing else. He had no opportunity of carrying out his views, and we doubt if he could have ultimately succeeded. The policy of forming alliances, terminable at her own pleasure, is one that any nation will find but temporarily successful. Bad as the Family Compact was, it could not have been worse than the confederation by

which England proposed to offset it; and only a few years later, all southern Europe, and England herself, looked on with powerless indignation at the partition of Poland between the Northern powers.

We take a few extracts from these volumes which will interest American readers; they refer to his Majesty's sensibility on a certain subject, and to the proposition to give presents to the American Commissioners. Mr. Fox writes to the King, August 6th, 1783:—

“Mr. Laurens was yesterday with Mr. Fox, to desire him to take your Majesty's pleasure whether it would be agreeable to your Majesty to receive a Minister from the United States. Mr. Fox, knowing your Majesty's opinion upon this subject from what your Majesty did him the honor to say to him some time since, and feeling that it cannot be an agreeable subject to dwell upon, would have taken upon himself to have answered in the affirmative, if it had not been rather pointedly put to him *to take your Majesty's royal pleasure.*”

To which the Royal George most graciously deigns to answer, —

“As to the question whether I wish to receive a Minister from America, I certainly can never express its being agreeable to me; and indeed, I should think it wisest for both parties to have only agents, who can settle any matters of commerce; but so far I cannot help adding, that I shall ever have a bad opinion of any Englishman who would accept of being an accredited Minister for that revolted state, and which certainly cannot for years establish a stable government.”

Mr. Fox writes to the Duke of Manchester, August 21, 1783, upon the article of presents: —

“What are we to do with the four Americans? Whatever is given to them must be in money, or at least, not in pictures; and will not one thousand pounds to each be thought a great deal? — I am sorry to say (this is in perfect confidence) that the King's awkwardness upon these little matters relative to the Americans, appeared to me rather to increase than to diminish.”

The Duke in answer writes: —

“I have talked with Mr. Hartley in regard to the presents to be given to the American Ministers, and proposed that a couple of 1000*l.* should be given amongst them, which he thought, with me, would be

very handsome and satisfactory, and has undertaken to mention it in a friendly way to Dr. Franklin."

This matter is entirely new to us: Mr. John Adams, to be sure, in his journal, says that, upon one occasion, Mr. Oswald told him that "the picture" would undoubtedly be given to him; but neither from the correspondence of the Commissioners, nor from any other source, are we able to learn that any presents were received by them. Probably, if the £2000 was divided amongst them, it was devoted to paying their expenses in Paris.

The success Mr. Fox had met with in his settlement of the Irish difficulties, (a matter which we have not space to enlarge upon,) encouraged him to bring forward his celebrated India Bill, which was the signal for the downfall of the coalition. Mr. Fox's bill placed the whole civil and military government of India under a Board of nine members, chosen for four years, and not removable without an address from either House of Parliament. Such a Board would unquestionably be an independent authority in the state, and the opposition took every advantage which sophistry could suggest or the undue influence of the King afford them. It was said that its design was to make the power of a party rival that of the King. In a speech of two hours, Mr. Fox unfolded the plan of the bill, and was gallantly met by Mr. Pitt, who headed the opposition. It was evident the administration must stand or fall by the success of the measure. It was but an equivocal argument in favor of the bill, that, during the debates, news was received from India that Tippoo had captured an entire English army, and was fast recovering the territory that had been wrested from him. The bill passed the House by a fair majority, and it was at this stage that his Majesty conspired with the opposition to defeat his own government.

The recent publication of the Duke of Buckingham upon the Court of George III. discloses the machinery by which Mr. Fox was betrayed and destroyed. Lord Thurlow had very early intimated to the Secretary that an English peerage, of which the Fox family were very desirous for their connection, Lord Ossory, an Irish peer, would be granted if the great seal, which was in commission, were restored to him. But as Lord

Thurlow would have been a spy in the cabinet, and his presence would only hasten its dissolution, the proposition was declined. Lord Temple, a leader in the opposition, was soon in secret communication with the King, to aid his Majesty in getting rid of the chains which pressed upon him. He advised the King to throw upon his ministers the responsibility of certain public measures, which could not fail to produce dissensions, and upon their resignation, to dissolve the Parliament. With this understanding, when the bill came before the Lords, a paper was placed in the hands of Lord Temple, to the effect that "his Majesty allows Earl Temple to say that whoever voted for the India Bill was not only not his friend, but would be considered by him as an enemy; and if these words were not strong enough, Earl Temple might use whatever words he might deem stronger, and more to the purpose." To this outrage upon the constitution, the Peers quietly succumbed, and the bill was lost. Then Lord North and Mr. Fox, not resigning, were of course dismissed. The latter attempted to overthrow the ministry which succeeded him, upon a final issue between the prerogative of the crown and the privileges of the House of Commons involved in the dissolution of Parliament. But although the House supported him even to the extent of a resolution that the King's name had been unconstitutionally used, it was of no avail. The political influence of Charles Fox was almost irrevocably lost, the Parliament was dissolved, and the general election which ensued determined, for more than forty years, the question of the government of England.

Lord John Russell does not attempt to defend the coalition. Mr. Fox himself, and his friends, averred that success was its only justification; it failed, and they are condemned on the plea of "guilty." The public mind was shocked to find Mr. Fox acting with a man he had so often denounced for ignorance and incapacity, and they had a right to suppose that his denunciations had not been honest. On the other hand, they could not think that the friends of Lord North had been sincere in their frequent, open reprobation of Mr. Fox's scandalous private life, as unfitting him for the service of the state. The coalition was a breach of public morality; the confidence of

the nation in its leaders was lost; and while the remote consequences of that distrust were incalculably pernicious, no one can regret the personal disgrace that overtook the perpetrators of so great a political fraud.

The events which occurred in the ten years following the overthrow of the coalition ministry are passed hurriedly over. Mr. Fox was, of course, active in opposition. He spoke often in the debates on the Regency question during the temporary incapacity of the sovereign. He opposed the accession of George III. as Elector of Hanover to the German confederation, and he was deceived by a letter from the Prince of Wales into an indignant denial of that person's marriage with Mrs. Fitzherbert, while Parliament was hesitating about the payment of his debts. The correspondence closes at the brink of the French Revolution. The course which Mr. Fox took during that stormy period is well known; but we take leave of him here. The curtain was soon to rise upon a drama more terrible than any in which he had ever acted; it fared ill with humanity, that his part in it could not be that to which his talents entitled him. Had he controlled the action of the English cabinet during the anarchic convulsions of France, it is not too much to say, that the horrors of the contest would have been mainly avoided. But this was not to be; for they who had counselled American coercion had gained over the young champion of liberty, and now counselled the measures which caused most of the atrocities of the intestine and foreign wars of the French Revolution.

ART. V. — *Bleak House*. By CHARLES DICKENS. *With Illustrations by H. K. BROWNE*. London: Bradbury and Evans. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1853.

A HUNDRED years ago, when Richardson and Sterne lent the weight of their example to the new-fangled plan of composing and publishing their fictitious compositions at intervals, some *laudator temporis acti* ill naturedly put forward his prediction that, in process of time, the evil practice would take such root